

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1, 5-12 and 25-29 are now present in the application. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Claim 1 is independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Reasons For Entry Of Amendments

As discussed in greater detail hereinafter, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 are improper and should immediately be withdrawn. Accordingly, the finality of the Final Office Action mailed on September 25, 2007 should be withdrawn.

If the Examiner persists in maintaining his rejections, Applicants submit that this Amendment was not presented at an earlier date in view of the fact that Applicants are responding to a new ground of rejection set forth in the Final Office Action. In accordance with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.116, Applicants respectfully request entry and consideration of the foregoing amendments as they remove issues for appeal.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 has been objected to due to the presence of minor informalities. In view of the foregoing amendments, in which the Examiner's helpful suggestions have been followed, it is respectfully submitted that this objection has been addressed. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully submit that this objection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 25-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin, U.S. Patent No. 6,396,177, in view of Kurihara, JP 10-210727. Claims 5-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin in view of Kurihara, and further in view of Yokota, U.S. Patent No. 7,078,841. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

In light of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. While not conceding to the Examiner's rejections, but merely to expedite prosecution, as the Examiner will note, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements including "a plurality of upper blades are located above the top of the rotor for supplying external air to an upper part of the rotor when the rotor is rotated." Support for the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1 can be found in FIGs. 4 and 5 as originally filed. Applicants respectfully submit that the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

The Examiner has correctly acknowledged that Shin and Kurihara fail to teach any upper blades. Therefore, Shin and Kurihara also fail to teach "a plurality of upper blades are located

above the top of the rotor for supplying external air to an upper part of the rotor when the rotor is rotated” as recited in amended claim 1.

The Examiner then turned to rely on Yokota’s teachings of fins 16 and referred to Yokota’s fins 16 as the upper blades of the claimed invention. However, as shown in FIGs. 1-3 of Yokota, the fins 16 are located inside the flywheel 11 and along the inner circumferential wall 11a of the flywheel 11. In addition, the top end of the fins 16 simply matches the top end of the flywheel 11 of the rotor. In other words, Yokota’s fins 16 are not located *above the top of the rotor*. Therefore, Yokota fails to teach “a plurality of upper blades are located *above the top of the rotor* for supplying external air to an upper part of the rotor when the rotor is rotated” as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, none of the utilized references individually or in combination teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 1 clearly defines over the teachings of the utilized references.

In addition, claims 5-12 and 25-29 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, and are therefore allowable based on their respective dependence from independent claim 1, which is believed to be allowable.

In addition, claim 5 further recites “the upper blades extend upwardly from the top of the rotor and protrude upwardly above the rotor cup.” As mentioned, as shown in FIGs. 2 and 3 of Yokota, the top end of Yokota’s fins 16 simply matches the top end of the flywheel 11 (referred to by the Examiner as the rotor cup), and therefore does not protrude upwardly *above the*

flywheel 11. Therefore, Yokota also fails to teach “the upper blades extend upwardly from the top of the rotor and *protrude upwardly above the rotor cup*” as recited in claim 5.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 5-12 and 25-29 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petition for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application.

Application No. 10/752,548
Amendment dated January 25, 2008
After Final Office Action of September 25, 2007

Docket No.: 2832-0174P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 25, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James T. Eller, Jr.

Registration No.: 39,538

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

